

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Examiner's Action mailed September 14, 2004, with a shortened statutory period of three months set to expire December 14, 2004. Claims 1, 4-8, 11-15, and 18-21 are currently pending. With this amendment, claims 1, 8 and 15 have been amended.

Applicants have amended the independent claims to describe selecting a device driver to be installed. A plurality of clients to receive the device driver are selected. A plurality of different versions of the device driver are stored where each version is executable by only a different one of the operating systems. The server then gathers a network address of each one of the selected clients. The server determines an operating system being executed by each one of these clients. A file is then created that includes a plurality of entries. Each entry includes a specification of a client, the operating system determined for the client, and the network address determined for the client. The different versions of the device driver are distributed to the selected clients by: getting an entry from the file, creating an install directory on the client specified in the entry, determining an operating system listed in the entry, selecting a version of the device driver that is executable by the determined operating system, executing a remote copy command to copy the selected version to the install directory created on the client, causing by the server the client specified by the entry to execute an install command to install the selected device driver version, and repeating this distribution for each entry of the file.

One example of support for this amendment can be found in the specification on page 17, line 32 through page 19, line 19.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-8, 11-15, and 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,742,829 issued to *Davis* in view of U.S. Patent 6,678,888 issued to *Sakanishi*. This rejection, as it might be applied to the claims as amended, is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner states that *Davis* teaches the features of the claims except for the step of creating a file that includes a plurality of entries. The Examiner relies on *Sakanishi* to supply these missing features.

Applicants claim gathering, by the server, a network address of each specified client. Neither *Davis* nor *Sakanishi* teaches gathering, by the server, a network address of each specified client.

Applicants claim determining, by the server, an operating system being executed by each specified client. Neither *Davis* nor *Sakanishi* teaches determining, by the server, an operating system being executed by each specified client.

Applicants claim creating a file that includes multiple entries where each entry specifies a client, a different operating system that was determined for that client, and a network address that was determined for that client. Neither *Davis* nor *Sakanishi* teaches creating a file that includes multiple entries where each entry specifies a client, a different operating system that was determined for that client, and a network address that was determined for that client.

Sakanishi teaches several different tables with different entries. These entries are used by *Sakanishi* to select the appropriate software to be installed on a client server or a client. None of these tables or entries, however, describes a file that includes entries where each entry specifies a client, an operating system that was determined by the server for the client, and a network address that was determined by the server for the client.

The entries of *Sakanishi* include a software identifying ID, a version, a priority, and a controlled system. The specification of the controlled system does not include a specified client, the operating system that was determined by the server as being executed by this client, and the network address that was determined by the server for this client.

With reference to Figure 12, *Sakanishi* teaches that a user can enter the IP address of a controlled system that is a recipient of the software. See column 9, lines 61-65. This section does not describe, teach, or suggest, however, a server computer system gathering the network address for each specified client. This section describes a user entering the information. Further, this section does not teach a file that includes entries where each entry specifies a client, the operating system executed by the client, and the network address of that client. This section of the reference describes creating entries such as depicted by Figure 9 of the reference. Neither Figure 9, nor any other figure or description of the reference, teaches a file that includes entries where each entry specifies a client, the operating system executed by the client, and the network address of that

client. In addition, Neither Figure 9, nor any other figure or description of the reference, teaches a file that includes entries where each entry specifies a client, the operating system determined by the server as being executed by the client, and the network address determined by the server of that client.

Applicants also claim getting an entry from the file and creating an install directory on the client that is specified by the entry. Neither reference describes, teaches, or suggests these features.

Applicants claim determining an operating system listed in the entry, selecting the version of the device driver that is executable by this operating system, and then executing a remote copy command to copy the selected version to the install directory created on the client where the remote copy command uses the network address specified in the entry. Neither reference describes, teaches, or suggests these features.

Applicants claim the server causing the client to execute an install command to install the selected version. Neither reference describes, teaches, or suggests this feature in combination with the other features of the claim.

Applicants also claim repeating the distribution step for each entry in the file. Neither reference describes, teaches, or suggests this feature.

The claims are believed to be patentable over the cited prior art. Neither reference, either singly or in combination, describes, teaches, or suggests the features of Applicants' claims.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the below-listed telephone number if in the opinion of the examiner such a telephone conference would expedite or aid the prosecution and examination of this application.

DATE: 12.14.04

Respectfully submitted,



Lisa L.B. Yociss
Reg. No. 36,975
Yee & Associates, P.C.
P.O. Box 802333
Dallas, TX 75380
(972) 385-8777
Attorney for Applicants